

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated March 6, 2006 contained a final rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-24. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15 and 24. Claims 1-2 and 4-24 are in the case. Please consider the present amendment with the attached Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This amendment is in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hattori (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,674) and Scholl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,762).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The combined references do not disclose all of the Applicant's elements. Namely, the claims now include automatically allowing at least one new member to join the confederacy if the new member indicates that it has embedded content or other resources of interest to existing members of the confederacy. In addition, claim 24 also includes wherein the reciprocal monitoring relationships includes acknowledging an object addition, deletion, or change that has been received by a monitored device.

In contrast, Hattori in combination with Scholl et al. merely disclose an information processing device with a quality of service system that allows a user that is not fully versed with the service to appropriately use the service (see Abstract and col. 2, lines 32-35 of Hattori) and a network management gateway with a unified, remote, graphical, transparent interface for Web users, working at a Web client, to a variety of managed networks (see Abstract and col. 3, lines 42-64 of Scholl et al.), which is very different from the Applicant's claimed automatically allowing new members to join if the new member indicates that it has embedded content of interest to existing members and reciprocal monitoring relationships that includes acknowledging an object addition, deletion, or change.

Instead, the combination of Hattori with Scholl et al. simply discloses basic monitoring capabilities. For example, Hattori in combination with Scholl et al. explicitly disclose a monitor means "...that communicates with the information processing system and in response to a request for information related to the state of each section of the information processing apparatus, the state monitor means collects information via the network interface independently of operation of the information processing system, thereby transmitting the attained information to the request source." (see col. 8, lines 18-26 of Hattori) and a common user interface and common means for monitoring and controlling devices on a network (see col. 4, lines 47-51 of Scholl et al.).

Clearly, this combination is missing at least the Applicant's automatically allowing at least one new member to join the confederacy if the new member indicates that it has embedded content or other resources of interest to existing members of the confederacy of claims 1-2 and 4-23 and the reciprocal monitoring relationships includes acknowledging an object addition, deletion, or change that has been received by a monitored device of claim 24.

This **failure** of the combined cited references to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness. W.L. Gore & Assocs. V. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Accordingly, the combined cited references cannot render the Applicants' invention obvious.

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on at least the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03).


In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant

kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575.

Please note that all correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: June 6, 2006



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX